

Not "United Nations" but "United Industries" should be considered for global warming and Paris agreement

Keita Taniguchi, Zenta CEO

Yoshiyasu Takefuji, Ph.D.

professor of keio university

Brigitte Knopf et al. mentioned the withdrawal of the United States from the Paris agreement and the replacement of the United States. There are pros and cons in global warming and Paris agreement. In the 18th century, the issue of population explosion, proposed by Malthus, was a global issue like the current global warming problem. The solution to the population explosion given by the researchers was mainly the management of the population. It was very natural to think about the solution in the framework of "nation". However, the population explosion was avoided not by the human solution but by the miracle of demographic transition. The miracle of demographic transition was beyond the imagination of the competent researchers.

In order to realize a low-carbon society, industry must play a key role. Because the CO2 increase is due to the result of activities of these industries where "United Industries" should be discussed instead of "United Nations". Industries are always trying to meet the needs of people all over the world. Super-multinational industries exist in our society. They divide the functions of manufacturing, production, sales, planning, and so on, and dynamically and globally arrange with their capital logic.

The most upstream of capitalism in our modern society is a part of the financial communities. Although they do not appear on the front stage, they are undoubtedly owners and/or leaders in the industry. The financial world has a huge power in our modern society and occupies most of the capital. Therefore, the financial community should pay the contribution of the Paris agreement.

## References

1. Brigitte Knopf et al., " Germany and China take the lead," Science 03 Nov 2017: Vol. 358, Issue 6363, pp. 569  
<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/358/6363/569.full>